

Remarks

Applicants and the undersigned wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies she extended during the telephone interview that occurred on January 17, 2006. During the interview, pending independent Claims 53, 64, 80, 86 and 96 were discussed. More specifically, the undersigned discussed with the Examiner differences between the present invention and the cited prior art references, namely U.S. Patent 5,758,512 to Peterson et al. and U.S. Patent 5,069,273 to O'Hearne, as well as the Examiner's interpretation of the claim language.

The undersigned discussed with the Examiner several possible amendments to the claims for overcoming the cited prior art references. Applicants have incorporated those amendments into the pending claims. Although no agreement was reached with respect to patentability of the claims in the subject application, the Examiner indicated that substantial progress has been made in furthering prosecution of the subject application. The foregoing Amendment has been made in consequence of the Examiner Interview.

Claims 16-18, 21, 22, 24, 26-37, 53-57, 59-64, 66-75, 77-86, 88, 95 and 96 are now pending in this application. Claims 58 and 87 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 53, 64, 80, 86 and 96 are patentable over the cited prior art references.

Claims 54-57 and 59-63 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 53. When the recitations of these claims are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 53, Applicants submit that Claims 54-57 and 59-63 likewise are patentable over the cited prior art references.

Claims 66-72 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 64. When the recitations of these claims are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 64, Applicants submit that Claims 66-72 likewise are patentable over the cited prior art references.

Claims 81-85 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 80. When the recitations of these claims are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 80,

Applicants submit that Claims 81-85 likewise are patentable over the cited prior art references.

Claim 88 depends from independent Claim 86. When the recitations of this claim are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 86, Applicants submit that Claim 88 likewise is patentable over the cited prior art references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Eric T. Krischke
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070